



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,042	03/25/2004	Andrew Michael Duggan	CRUI/0012	5804

7590 08/21/2009  
WILLIAM B. PATTERSON  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
Suite 1500  
3040 Post Oak Blvd.  
Houston, TX 77056

EXAMINER
----------

SULLIVAN, DEBRA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3725

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/21/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/809,042	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DUGGAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DEBRA M. SULLIVAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Debra Sullivan. (3) Walt Grollitsch.

(2) Dana Ross. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Metcalfe et al (US 6,543,552).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the expansion device of Metcalfe et al does not induce a hoop stress as interpreted by the examiner in the office action dated May 1, 2009. Applicant was advised to provide evidence to support the claim that the expansion device of Metcalfe et al does not contact the tubing at the hoop stress expansion member as interpreted by the examiner and therefore cannot induce a hoop stress within the tubing for expansion.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Debra M Sullivan/ Examiner, Art Unit 3725	
---	--